Ser. No. 10/563,892 PU030213

Amdt. dated August XX, 2009

Reply to Office action of January 28, 2009

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-20 are pending and claims 1-20 stand rejected. In this response claims 1,8 and 14 are amended.

35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiroi, U.S. Patent No. 6,204,887 in view of Glen, et al., US 6,462,786. Hiroi discloses to assess the demand for system responses to process multiple images in a single display screen and to resize one or more of the displayed windows in order to preclude exceeding the available system resources. Please see column 6 lines 52 – 57, for example.

"FIGS. 2A – 2C illustrate various embodiments of the present invention, wherein the window size of one or more windows being displayed at the same time is adjusted (emphasis added) so that the demand for system resources ... will not exceed the available resources."

Contrary to the disclosure of Hiroi, the present application recites, as in claim 1,

"apply the <u>same</u> embedded picture setting data to the <u>entire</u>

(emphasis added) displayed screen if the system is not in the OSD

mode"

Whereas Hiroi alters each window separately under certain conditions, the present application either applies the same embedded picture setting data to the entire displayed screen or withholds the embedded picture setting data from the entire displayed screen. Support for the amendment of claim 1 is found in the specification text on page 4 lines 17 – 20

"If the video system 10 is not currently in an On Screen Display or other Graphic Centric Mode, ... the embedded picture data alone is used to select the screen format and an associated color conversion matrix."

Ser. No. 10/563,892 Amdt. dated August XX, 2009

Reply to Office action of January 28, 2009

and in Fig. 1 where it is graphically indicated that the color conversion and display format are set for the image being displayed after the OSD signal is combined with the input video signal.

Examiner incorporates Glen, stating that Glen discloses the feature of detecting the input video type and converting it into a suitable display format. Glen does not, however, suggest to format the display to that of the format embedded in the video signal if the system is not in an OSD mode and withhold the embedded picture setting data from the display if the system is in the OSD mode. Note in figure 2 and the text that Glen discloses to format each input signal's format to that of the display; whereas the current invention teaches to format the entire display screen to that of the video signal's embedded picture setting data if the system is not in the OSD mode and to withhold the embedded picture setting data from the entire display screen if the system is in the OSD mode.

There is no suggestion in Hiroi or in Glen, singly or together, to "...apply the <u>same</u> embedded picture setting data to the <u>entire</u> display screen if the system is not in the OSD mode; and withhold the embedded picture setting data from the <u>entire</u> display screen if the system is in the OSD mode." With the amendment of claim 1, the Applicant respectfully asserts the rejection is traversed.

Claims 8 and 14 have been amended in a manner similar to the amendment of claim 1 and thus are believed allowable for all the reasons enumerated above. Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of 1, 8 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Claims 2 – 7, 9 – 13 and 15 – 20, being properly drawn to independent claims believed to be allowable are also allowable. Withdrawal of rejections of dependent claims 2 – 7, 9 – 13 and 15 – 20 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance.

Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the

Ser. No. 10/563,892 PU030213

Amdt. dated August XX, 2009

Reply to Office action of January 28, 2009

Examiner is invited to contact the applicants' attorney at (386) 438-8034, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No additional fee is believed due. However, if an additional fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted, Janghwan Lee et al

By: Robert D. Shedd Reg. No. 36,269 Phone (609) 734-6828

Patent Operations Thomson Licensing Inc. P.O. Box 5312 Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312 August 12. 2009

	CERTIFICATE OF MAILING
	I hereby certify that this amendment is being faxed to Mail Stop AMENDMENT, Commissioner for Patents,
	Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, facsimile no. 571-273-2885 on :
	August 12, 2009 /Kathleen Lyles/
	Date Signature
i	